EDITED BY
E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS

B-836

# THE SHAMEFUL DECLINE OF THE "TRUTH SEEKER"

## HOW A ONCE-FINE ORGAN OF FREETHOUGHT FELL INTO THE CLUTCHES OF IGNOBLE BIGOTS AND BECAME A SEWER FOR ANTI-SEMITISM

BY

MORDECAI T. HELLER

E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS

JOHN D. McINERNEY

45-
3144

# THE SHAMEFUL DECLINE OF THE "TRUTH SEEKER"

## HOW A ONCE-FINE ORGAN OF FREETHOUGHT FELL INTO THE CLUTCHES OF IGNOBLE BIGOTS AND BECAME A SEWER FOR ANTI-SEMITISM

BY

MORDECAI T. HELLER

E. HALDEMAN-JULIUS

JOHN D. McINERNEY

HALDEMAN-JULIUS PUBLICATIONS
GIRARD, KANSAS

Copyright, 1949,
by E. Haldeman-Julius

Printed in the United States of America

# THE DECLINE AND FALL OF "THE TRUTH SEEKER"

## BY MORDECAI T. HELLER

Mr. Marshall J. Gauvin's rambling and sickeningly inane article, "Haldeman-Julius's Hypocrisy," which appeared in the July issue of the melancholy *Truth Seeker,* is characterized by the general lack of critical intelligence which usually accompanies the harangue of its author. His inability to grasp a point in dispute, especially when it pertains to anti-Semitism, is, by this time, well known in the Freethought movement. His charge of hypocrisy leveled against a man who has done more for the Freethought cause than a thousand Gauvins, simply adds gall to unmitigated idiocy. The wisest thing Mr. Gauvin could have done (as was advised a person who lived in a glass house—namely, not to play indoor golf) was to have remained silent.

His much-heralded and vaunted "challenge" to Haldeman-Julius would be laughable if it weren't so utterly childish, stupid and pathetic. Couldn't this stooge defender of the *Truth Seeker* editor (who meanwhile sits back and lets others do the fighting for him) have seen that the material that Haldeman-Julius and I published was thoroughly documented; chapter and verse were quoted, and the reader was asked to go to the record—in this case what had appeared in the ignoble *Truth Seeker?* But, as I have warned the readers before, these fellows utilize the smoke screen technique. They believe they can confuse the readers that way. The evasions indulged in by the *Truth Seeker* and Mr. Gauvin are so conspicuous that they stick out like a sore thumb.

When the backward and conceited editor of the *Truth Seeker* made an attempt to reply to the barrage of criticism that was aimed at him from many quarters, he wrote, under the caption "The Editor Stands Accused," that he doesn't over-eat, is practically a total abstainer, refrains from smoking and, above all, doesn't like novels containing that awful four-letter-word, and wouldn't mind seeing such books banned. This was supposed to constitute a reasonable, logical, sensible answer to the pointed questions numerous Freethinkers were beginning to ask about the legacy-seeking game and one-man rule. He didn't dare touch upon his important contributions to modern scientific thought—that there is no such phenomenon as hypnotism, that amnesia is a fake, etc. Perhaps he had a few bad dreams when he discovered what a 20th century Rationalist thought of such pristine ignorance on the part of an editor of a Freethought journal.

Mr. Gauvin can rant and rave, but his record in regard to anti-Semitism is known to not alone Jews but to Freethinkers of other so-called categories, also. His precious advice that the Jews should leave the question of anti-Semitism "alone," his cutting remark in the July *Truth Seeker,* "Have the Jews accumulated their wealth, and they have a good stack of it, by giving away what they might sell?"—his bringing forth with the glee of a great discoverer that the Bible, in which both orthodox Jews and Gentiles believe, allows Jews to sell tainted meat to strangers—his general, persistent prejudice against the Jews which has, by this time, become odoriferous, don't fool many readers.

It annoys Mr. Gauvin, the champion of the private ownership of the *Truth Seeker,* that the Jews have "a good stack of it (wealth)."

I suggested to him that if he knew of *any* butcher, Jew or Gentile who was engaged in selling tainted meat, to report the infraction immediately to the nearest Board of Health Station and stop wrapping the flag around himself.

He charges that a certain person forged his name to a post card which stated that "The Jew as a Rationalist isn't worth a damn." He claims he knows from where that card came; but evidently can't prove it. In making the grave and anti-Semitic insinuation that certain Jewish butchers are selling tainted meat he stops short when it comes to establishing this matter on a basis of proof. Now, come, Mr. Gauvin, who are the butchers? Name and address, please? No would-be Ingersollian oratory, no evasion, no retreating from the field.

Some time ago, the world's outstanding Freethinker and Rationalist scholar, Mr. Joseph McCabe, paid Mr. Haldeman-Julius a tribute. As some readers might have overlooked this deserved evaluation, it might not be amiss to quote it again:

> "Haldeman-Julius has done more for Freethought than all the Freethinking organizations put together."

At the time I quoted this vital opinion by McCabe I didn't want to add gilt to gold; however, as this phrase, undoubtedly, irked the editor of the *Truth Seeker* and his dutiful stooges, I will add more from the same article that this veteran Freethinker penned.

> "A gifted individual writer may stand out, but too often the respectability which he respects infects and conquers him in the end. Haldeman-Julius has created a core of all round realists and provided a powerful publicity for them. With his own lively, vigorous, fluent writing and wide knowledge he has led the attack on the philistines, and his ripe editorial experience has been of great service to us all. . . .
>
> "But, as I said, the supreme merit of his work is its comprehensiveness, its gay and sparkling tilting at all windbags. He has a few jokes about immortality in his autobiography. He probably cares no more about the opinion of posterity than I do, but the fact is that he will be remembered as a personality, a force, in America's thought-world . . . he has helped hundreds of thousands along the road to real freedom."

The aforementioned citation represents the opinion of that grand, world-renowned, Freethought scholar; a man who has written, literally, hundreds of books, not to mention countless articles, and to whom so many of us are so dearly indebted.

Now, let us look at the opinion of Mr. Gauvin, a man who has the temerity to take himself seriously as a defender of Freethought as exemplified by the oafish *Truth Seeker*. Here are some of the observations Mr. Gauvin makes of Mr. Haldeman-Julius:

> ". . . . his well practiced vocabulary of barroom billingsgate . . . . with his customary easy irresponsibility . . . Haldeman-Julius calls The Freeman a Freethought paper, but only a few of its articles are devoted to what is properly called Freethought. . . . Certainly it is the only journal calling itself a Freethought paper that violates the decent proprieties of civilized life by reveling in dirt; and it does not appear to be a paper likely to inform its readers very fully in the principles of Freethought."

Freethinkers, take your choice of opinions! There is no middle road. The difference is too great between both. Examine the record and make up your own mind. McCabe versus Gauvin!

This trained seal of the *Truth Seeker*, however, feels constrained to state:

> "The *Truth Seeker* appreciates what Haldeman-Julius has done for Freethought. It has never in a single instance sought to disparage in any manner that service. Nor has

it been moved to the smallest degree of resentment or disapproval by any tribute Joseph McCabe has paid the publisher of the Little Blue Books."

At this point, no doubt, the reader has discovered that Mr. Gauvin is a mass of pathologic contradictions and that, so far as rational disputation is concerned, it is absolutely futile to discuss anything with him. He holds no "disapproval" against any tribute Mr. McCabe bestowed upon Mr. Haldeman-Julius and his valuable publications, nevertheless, he rants, raves, and throws *Truth Seeker* sewerage at one of the greatest men in the history of American Freethought. This, fellow Freethinkers, is the champion the *Truth Seeker* put into the arena. Draw your own conclusions.

It might behove us to return to Mr. Gauvin and his annoyance at the fact that the Jews have "a stack of wealth." I hear echoes of Streicher & Co. But, let us see what this worthy apologist has to say for himself. It is always salutary to return to the record.

When I gave chapter and verse of his remarks about the Jews and the alleged sale of tainted meat to strangers, I emphasized his insidious statement: "And may we conclude that it would be asking too much to expect an enterprising Jew to give away what he might sell." It seems, according to Mr. Gauvin, that I did not quite grasp what he was driving at. So, let's have him explain it in his own words.

Quoting the Bible, Mr. Gauvin brings to our attention:

> "Therefore they enjoined the Jewish people to give this diseased and poisonous flesh to the strangers dwelling among them, to sell it to aliens."

And, so far as his affirmation about Jewish butchers is concerned, well, it was "a bit of humor." Why this brand of melancholy humor should appear in a book dealing with the "fundamentals" of Freethought, especially at the expense of the Jews, is not accounted for by this saintly individual.

Mr. Gauvin sees fit to write in his article "Haldeman-Julius's Hypocrisy" that Mr. Haldeman-Julius has "a fairly handsome accumulation" (of wealth). Shades of Hitler & Co.! So far as Mr. Gauvin is concerned and his terrible distaste of enlightened books on sex, I think that, considering his "humor," he might have laughed himself silly at either Buchenwald or Dachau. How did he find out how much money the Jews have?

His preface in explanation of his anti-Semitic remarks, "There comes a bit of humor. . . ." is in poor taste, especially as it emanates from a man who doesn't like the jokes and wit which appear in The American Freeman. Which is more dangerous?

Should anyone be interested in finding out why the idiotic editor of the Truth Seeker and his trained stooges are yelling their empty heads off, it is suggested that the interested, decent, well-intentioned Freethinker study the following shadows on the wall so far as the *Truth Seeker* is concerned, and what has happened since the expose of the dangerous conditions existing in the form of one-man-ownership, collecting legacies, and asking for donations to be used as one man, and, only one man, desires. This condition should be foreign to the noble Freethought movement. We didn't place anyone upon a throne.

Since Freethinkers have learned through Haldeman-Julius publications what the real state of affairs is in the movement, the following drop has taken place in the "take" of the so-called *Truth Seeker*:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| March, | 1949 ..... | $250.15 |
| April, | 1949 ..... | 178.66 |
| May, | 1949 ..... | 167.40 |
| June, | 1949 ..... | 69.75 |
| July, | 1949 ..... | 19.00 |

I think the facts speak for themselves and need no explanation other than that you can't fool all the people all the time.

Fellow Freethinkers, it is not simply a question of anti-Semitism or sheer idiocy on the part of an individual who wants to collect legacies and donations, to have them become *his own, private prop-*

*erty,* so that he can continue to publish his own nonsense, idiocy, stupidity and ravings in the good name of Freethought.

The movement is, by far, greater than any legacy-seeking person who claims he deserves a prime place in it. We are fighters for Libertarianism, Rationalism, humanity; not for the pet whims and racial prejudices of a person who is centuries behind in his thinking.

Let us rid the movement of this parasite! Let us go forward on a democratic basis!

---

# MORE STUPIDITY FROM THE "TRUTH SEEKER"

## By John D. McInerney

A TROUBLED donor of some of the ingredients of the *Truth Seeker* (troubled queerly after having given himself the autohypnosis that the charge which disconcerted him is mere "raving"), pinch-hits for the editor in a crack to get his paper out of the blame of having been voicing the alarmingly prevalent bigotry against Jews.

Going back in his lightly receptive memory over "45 years" of *Truth Seeker* issues he does not "recall having seen in it a single line that was anti-Semitic," and, with the reckless conceit of the cocksparrow before being shot from the steeple by the bad boy, he cock-a-doodles a challenge to Mr. Haldeman-Julius "to produce a single sentence from any recent issue of this paper that may properly be construed as anti-Semitic."

Selecting a recent boner which the *Truth Seeker* pulled—"the old Jew book," he propounds, "What is anti-Semitic in that?" He has, without going back "45 years," found an anti-Jewish crack, but arrogantly denies it to be such. He "properly construes" his editor's smartalecky wit to be above Haldeman-Julius' "excretory wit."

"The old Jew book" would please any anti-Jew. Racist bait sticks out over the hook in it. It is evidently intended to insult the Jews in addition to criticizing the Bible. The Jews got it from the Babylonians, but the *Truth Seeker* would not have pleased fascistic anti-Semites by calling it the old Babylonian book, and adding that it is also the book still blessed by capitalist-Christian America, whose moral and religious influence has mainly, in the claims of even Capitalist Truman, "given the American people the highest standard of living the world has ever known," and that it is the book which Russia does not so dumbly fall for, and is happily emerging from the handicap of. Its opposition to the Christian book is the big reason why the scheming defenders of private enterprise never miss a chance to assault Russia. They publicly defend the Bible of America, while privately not caring a whoop for it, and the *Truth Seeker* goes along with and offers consolation to such hypocritical, anti-democratic company.

The answer to the *Truth Seeker's* apologist for anti-Jewism, who oafishly asks, "Would Mr. Smith be a better editor if, like Mr. Haldeman-Julius, he denounced President Truman and his leading associates as 'warmongers' because of the mighty efforts being put forth by the United States to prevent the appalling tragedy of a third World War?" is an easy "Yes." Nothing seems plainer than that the efforts of the capitalist-Christian United States have been to incite instead of to prevent another world war, this time with the false slogan that it is to make the world safe for Christianity and Capitalism and fascism, against Atheism and Communism. Mr. Smith would be a better editor if he knew this, and he is a dull editor and a muddy-brained Atheist if he can't see it. His calling to bat for him an equally thick-witted assistant

to goosily claim that the *Truth Seeker* is not anti-Jewish, when in the same breath it makes brazen its stiffnecked littleness toward Jews as Jews, adds to the evidence.

"The *Truth Seeker* . . . maintains . . . high standard. Mr. Haldeman-Julius knows the character of his paper." What weak, pointless bluffing and evading.

"Mr. Haldeman-Julius writes much for his paper and accepts advertisements which would not be admitted to the columns of the *Truth Seeker.*" . . . "Happy indeed is that country whose literature is of such a character that it can be replaced by the mother in the hands of her daughter with . . . assurance that while the mind is improved the heart is not polluted." The American press, with its daily lies, its war-inciting headlines, its liquor and cigarette advertisements, its nearly nude pictures of girls with men, its praise of fascistic principles and denouncement of democratic fundamentals, is not so offensive to the *Truth Seeker.* It is not untrue to hold that Atheism is stupidly represented by such a paper.

The atheistic *Truth Seeker* and the Catholic Spellman seem not to differ too much on Labor, strike breaking, private enterprise, the capitalist greatness and the criminal greatness of America, etc.

"To criticise the Jew as a citizen, as one would criticise any other citizen, is not . . . anti-Semitism," pleads the *Truth Seeker's* makeshift argument, and this again exposes its pretended innocence, for to criticise a citizen, if we are not spreading racism, we do not say a "Jew" citizen, an "Irish" citizen, a "Jew" book. To call the Bible a "Jew" book can add nothing to the argument against the Bible except race intolerance. Today, when anti-Semitism is so militant and organized, criticism of the Bible as a "Jew" book reveals the appeal of Racism, and an atheistic editor who makes the race appeal serve his anti-Bible sermon is stooping below decent standards of editing, if he does profess to be offended by "excretory wit." Is it gall or ignorance, or both, that moves the *Truth Seeker* to ask, "What is the ground for the statement that the *Truth Seeker* is stupidly edited?"

---

# THE "TRUTH SEEKER": A MENACE TO FREETHOUGHT

## By Mordecai T. Heller

Freethinkers interested in the progress of their splendid cause will, without any difficulty, see the reason for my repeated admonitions to beware of the evasive tactics of the *Truth Seeker* editor when answering criticism. It was pointed out that he generally raises totally extraneous issues and sets his usual smoke screen over the whole field. He also utilizes, quite freely, vile smear tactics. This is illustrated very well in his article, "A Fine Pair of Pals," in the June *Truth Seeker,* in which he tries to offset the devastating criticism leveled at him by Haldeman-Julius in *The American Freeman,* and the observations made by myself in The Critic and Guide, (April, July, and August). The criticisms and charges were specific and painfully to the point. Chapter and verse were quoted. Had the editor of the *Truth Seeker* possessed sufficient ethical grounds and forensic skill he could have replied to them and satisfied the large number of Rationalists who have, at long last, begun to ask questions.

The *Truth Seeker* takes the melancholy position that Haldeman-Julius and Wm. McCarthy "began the fight by (each) going out of his way to attack the *Truth Seeker* and its editor." For quite some time there has been a mounting dissatisfaction with its editorial policy. Even those who haven't followed this publication regularly are aware that it has sadly deteriorated since the death of George Macdonald. Only the deep-rooted conceit and obtuseness of the editor

prevented him from realizing this sad fact.

When much needed and painfully obvious criticism was drawn to this publication, its editor resorted to his usual legerdemain and jesuitical sophistry to prevent his readers from realizing what was going on.

Repeatedly, I urged all those who have the interests of the splendid Freethought movement at heart to take nobody's word for the issues involved, but *to go to the record.* I stressed this again and again, because I realized that if one delved into this matter objectively, the *Truth Seeker* would be shown up in its true light. The editor doesn't deny that all contributions and legacies given to his publication in the belief that they are being donated to a "movement" become his own, private property. Upon his demise, they will become the property of his heirs.

In attempting to make some sort of reply, poor as it may be, the editor writes:

> "He (Haldeman-Julius) publishes an article by Mordecai T. Heller (consisting largely of quotations from Haldeman-Julius) containing the following:
>
> "Is there anything to the observations made by the editor of the *Truth Seeker,* "Though lying should be avoided; it is neither necessary nor advisable to tell the full truth all the time'?"

He follows up this supposedly sage reflection with the following:

> "Insinuating that this expression of common sense, with its introductory clause against lying, indicates dishonesty is quite in keeping with the character and mentality of William McCarthy. Haldeman-Julius approves McCarthy's tactics."

Note that the editor has the temerity to state that not telling "the full truth all the time" is "common sense." Is it for this type of Freethought that you are paying your dollars? Who is this *fuehrer* who takes it on himself to dole out the truth as *he* sees fit? Who appointed him dictator of truth? Fellow Freethinkers, what do you think of an individual who calls himself a truth seeker, but who doesn't believe it is common sense to give you "the full truth all the time?" I suppose he ladles it out in quantities *he* believes you are entitled to. No more, no less. This is, indeed, a very fine principle.

When Wm. McCarthy in his truly devastating expose "Democracy or Dictatorship," sub-titled "A Reply to Lawyer Smith and the *Truth Seeker*" showed up this editor in a way that even his usual smoke screen and smear technique couldn't help him, his attempted reply was a pathetic piece of work. To this very day, he hasn't come to grips with the charges and criticisms. And, for a good reason; he can't. Nor does he dare to!

So far as Haldeman-Julius is concerned, his calling an ace an ace, and a spade a spade, undoubtedly roused the ire of the editor. It was the first time that an outstanding Freethinker and publisher had the guts to call his bluff. Did he attempt to show that Haldeman-Julius was in error? Did he attempt to meet the challenge? The oafish piece he published, captioned "The Editor Stands Accused," which I dealt with in the August issue of the Critic and Guide, made him a laughing stock with intelligent Freethinkers. Who cares what he eats? What he drinks? Or what he likes to have suppressed in literature because it contains (horror of horrors!) a four-letter word . . . Who raised any such criticism? Again, the smoke screen tactic.

Yes, he had his pal, Marshall J. Gauvin, attempt to explain matters, but, again, I urge those who have Freethought at heart, *to go to the record!* There they will find, for instance, what sort of a judge Mr. Gauvin is of anti-Semitism and other things.

The editor of the *Truth Seeker* shows symptoms of pathologic fear when it comes to the advisability of examining the record of his paper. Why not allow the reader to decide for himself after ascertaining the facts of the case? A Ra-

tionalist believes in thinking for himself.

To offer a mere portrayal of his forensic slight-of-hand he states that Haldeman-Julius published an article of mine "consisting largely of quotations from Haldeman-Julius." Observe carefully the word "largely." I presume he is referring to my "The Anti-Semitism of the *Truth Seeker*" which appeared in the July issue of The Critic and Guide. This piece contained only *two* solid quotes and was about five columns long. This takes care of the contention that it consisted "largely" of quotations from Haldeman-Julius. Why didn't this editor who doesn't believe in giving "the full truth all the time" inform the readers how many quotations I had in my piece from his anti-Semitic publication? My article was carefully documented. Was he trying to draw attention away from them? Let the reader peruse my article if he desires the truth, "the full truth," which Haldeman-Julius and I believe in stating "all the time." Perhaps, who knows, this may place us in the awful category of "A Fine Pair of Pals."

It might be pertinent to pose the query: why is the editor of the *Truth Seeker* so envious of other Freethought publications? Is the rapidly growing family of *American Freeman* and Critic and Guide readers, together with those who subscribe to *The Progressive World*, the handwriting on the wall for his melancholy sheet?

At this point, it might not be amiss to indulge in a little analysis. Since Haldeman-Julius started his house-cleaning in the Freethought movement as manifested by the backward and prejudiced *Truth* Seeker, the following drop has taken place in the contributions (not including the large legacy it recently acquired) made to this would-be liberal Rationalist paper. Note the downward trend:

| | |
|---|---|
| March 1949 ..... | $250.15 |
| April 1949 ..... | $178.66 |
| May 1949 ..... | $167.40 |
| June 1949 ..... | $69.75 |

Is this the reason why the bigoted, boorish, priggish editor is whining? Perhaps he can find out the cause in the wisening up of a vast number of honest, decent, liberal Freethinkers who are more interested in the advancement of their honorable movement than in having contributions become one man's private property, for him to print his pet prejudices, spiced with anti-Semitic and racist venom.

In the June number of this maladdressed paper, the editor, with his usual cultural perspicuity, refers insultingly to the noted Sigmund Freud as "the Jewish Dreamologist." This is the level at which this self-appointed dictator and censor argues his case against a world-renowned thinker. Let him shake hands with Father Coughlin and the Catholic Church.

The Jewish angle is not the only one. It has been said that we know a man by the sympathies he carries.

The same issue of this intellectually bereft publication see fit to *reprint* from a 1946 number, a defense of Gerald L. K. Smith's rights to free speech. Why, it may rightly be asked, does this publication of so-called liberalism and Freethought take out its sword to defend the alleged right of a notorious Fascist and anti-Semite? Why was it frozen silent when liberals and radicals had their rights infringed? Perhaps the editor, for example, might care to publish his defense of anti-Fascists and libertarians? There are many who would care to see it. . . .

Yes, let us have free speech for all, but, Mr. Editor, where *in the record* is your defense of those with whom your backward and reactionary views don't gibe?

It may be that he looks on the movement as he does on the contributions he receives, namely, as his own, private property, for him to do with as he wishes.

He was firmly against the founding of the National Liberal League when Wm. McCarthy suggested the idea, and joined in only when he saw that he would be left out. He also boasted that if Mr. McCarthy started such a league, he would gain control. (See the Lucia affidavit in "Democracy or Dictatorship).

On Mr. McCarthy's behalf it may

be said that he does not use contributions made to a cause to carry on a controversy. He published "Democracy or Dictatorship" with his own money. Incidentally, in this pamphlet, the reader will find a rather dark melancholy chapter in the history of American Freethought as carried on by the editor of the *Truth Seeker*. To be on the safe side, don't accept anyone's editorializing. Examine the facts and arrive at your own conclusion. Don't accept canned *Truth Seeker* opinion.

It is of vital importance for Freethinkers to acquaint themselves with this editor's tactics so that they can see through his smoke screen and not be victims of this legacy-seeking person.

In the present controversy, he has found a new technique: flag waving. Why didn't he wave the flag before this discussion arose?

Here is an individual who seeks legacies, donations and contributions, together with support for his paper which carries the name *Truth Seeker,* and yet doesn't believe in conveying the "full" truth "all the time."

If there are persons who care to contribute towards such a publication, it is their right; but, at least, they should be made aware of its editor's policy and principles.

Haldeman-Julius retains his place as the world's foremost Freethought publisher and editor. And, second only to Joseph McCabe, he is the world's foremost author of Freethought literature. McCabe and Haldeman-Julius are giants. The *Truth Seeker's* editors—Smith and Gauvin—are midgets.

---

# THE TRUTH SEEKER AND ITS EDITOR: A MENACE TO FREETHINKERS

## BY MORDECAI T. HELLER

At the risk of boring the reader it is necessary to repeat my original admonition to watch out for the smoke screen the *Truth Seeker* lays down when it is being shown up for what it really is. It would be wise to be on the alert for extraneous issues that its editor tries to bring into the discussion, and it would be wiser still to note that not a word comes from him or his trained stooge, Marshall J. Gauvin, about the game of collecting legacies and donations to become the property of the editor—all in the good name of Freethought. He can then use the money any way he sees fit and continue to spew out his racist venom, backward social views and laughable ignorance of modern scientific thought. If Mr. Haldeman-Julius ever rendered the Freethinkers a service, and countless are his acts to advance Freethought and universal education, he certainly rendered a signal one by exposing this backward, anti-Semitic and bigoted publication which has the brazen temerity to call itself the *Truth Seeker.*

Those who have gladly acknowledged their gratefulness to Haldeman-Julius for calling this gigantic bluff which has ridden like a millstone around the neck of American Freethought were, at the same time, astounded by the mental level of the *Truth Seeker* editor. His vaunted scientific "discoveries" —hypnotism is a fake, there is no such state of mind as amnesia, etc., shocked innumerable followers of the Rationalist movement. These matters are raised so that one may be able to judge what type of "leader" appointed himself as spokesman of our worthy cause. Incidentally, in the September issue of his ignorant publication he is still trying to explain his position on hypnotism and writes:

> "At any rate, those who publish and distribute books on hypnotism and psychoanalysis become as angry as priests do

when any one dares to laugh at their thrilling tales." (Leading *Truth Seeker* editorial, "Thrilling the Gullible Public").

For a man who supposedly represents the Freethought cause to show such ignorance is unpardonable. Any 7th grade school boy could have set him right had he the intelligence to ask him for information. But his dutiful trained-seal, Gauvin, while doing everything in his childish power to protect him from intelligent analysis, is compelled to admit:

> "And suppose the editor of the *Truth Seeker* is mistaken about hypnotism, is he not strictly within his right? An editor's right to be mistaken is part of what we mean by a free press."

The editor certainly takes first prize when it comes to be mistaken, not alone about elementary matters in psychology but in regard to vital questions pertaining to Freethought. It is not merely a question of this editor's lack of knowledge and violent prejudice against Jew, Negro or informed person who holds views on society that he won't catch up with in a century or two. It is a question of what he has done and is still doing to retard a movement which is the lifeblood of many emancipated thinkers and libertarians.

The *Truth Seeker* invariably begins to whine when it is put under the spotlight. It denies it is anti-Semitic, it engages in infantile flag-waving; it uses a smoke screen, it insults—perhaps out of sheer envy and jealousy—a man who has done more for Freethought in our country, not to speak of the untold numbers to whom he brought education and enlightenment—namely Mr. Haldeman-Julius—than any other man, living or dead.

The *Truth Seeker* cringes in cowardly fashion under the charges that Mr. Haldeman-Julius has made and insists hysterically that it is not anti-Semitic. Out of the mouths of babes and Balaam's jackass comes the truth, so let us see whether this puerile journal is innocent of the charges made. The best way of establishing the validity of the criticisms against it, is to put it on the witness stand and let it characterize itself by its own statements. It is a well known fact that many anti-Semites lack even the small amount of intelligence necessary to realize that they harbor such animosity.

Following the remarkable discovery made by the inane and conceited editor of the *Truth Seeker* that all the psychiatrists, psychologists and every one who has an I.Q. two points higher than a low grade moron were sunken in dark error when they believed in the phenomenon of hynotism, amnesia, etc., the fuehrer of the *Truth Seeker* group comes out with a more surprising find. What is it? "Semitic Freethought!"

Devoting a leading editorial under this caption to the education of his readers he deigns to define his rare nugget.

States this senile individual:

> "The emotional solution of intellectual problems might well be called 'Semitic Freethought.' Just as 'Christian Science' is not science, so Semitic Freethought is not Freethought, but is desire, a politico-economic program, masquerading as reason. It deceives the uncritical."

In short, if you agree with this piece of utter idiocy and bovinity, you are "critical," but, if you don't accept the opinion of this "learned" critic of psychology, you are "uncritical."

At this point, we wonder what a veteran like Chapman Cohen of the London *Freethinker* might think of such stupidity. Also, it might be well to compare the writings of the "Semitic" Chapman Cohen with those of the *Truth Seeker* editor. Aside from a leaflet or two, throughout the years that he has owned and edited this paper, he (the *T. S.* ed.) hasn't written anything worth a farthing, and if anyone doubts this, let him examine the record.

Marshall J. Gauvin who throws a dozen fits every time anyone

takes him to task for his obvious anti-Semitism, writes as follows about the Jews:

> "Only a tiny proportion of Jews—the very odd ones—support Freethought in any manner. Freethought is a non-Jewish movement, and Jews as a people are not interested in it."

I suppose one must first be baptized in Jesus Christ and then turn Freethinker to belong to the rationalist "herrenvolk." Freethought, according to this laughable oaf, is a "non-Jewish movement, and Jews as a people are not interested in it." This is the individual who wrote in "humor":

> "And may we not conclude that it would be asking too much to expect an enterprising Jew to give away what he might sell?" (This was in reference to the Biblical command that the Jews may sell tainted meat to strangers).

This is what Gauvin, the puritanical introvert, terms "humor."

He denies he wrote the post card which states "The Jew as a Rationalist Isn't Worth a Damn." But, according to his own words, "Freethought is a non-Jewish movement, and Jews as a people are not interested in it." Aren't the sentiments of the post card, regardless of whether he wrote it or not, the same? Doesn't he occupy the same position as if he admitted that he held such an opinion?

The *Truth Seeker* editor denies that his sheet is anti-Semitic. It might interfere with donations and legacies. There are still many intelligent, decent, humanitarians and thinkers who value their honorable cause. I don't know how much he knows of recent history—considering what he learned of psychology, but I wouldn't be surprised if he imbibed about the same amount. The August number of his would-be Freethought paper carries the following gem. Let the reader peruse it and draw his own conclusions and not accept manufactured *Truth Seeker* opinion:

> "The professional Semites should declare war on the World Almanac for publishing statistics showing that there are now more Jews than there were before the Nazis killed 6,000,000—more than one-third the total number. Some reports give 8,000,000. Such slaughter would slow down most any other group, but seems to have no appreciable effect on the Chosen People."

Isn't it just too bad, Mr. Editor of the *Truth Seeker*, that the slaughter of the helpless Jews wasn't as effective as you would have liked it to be? "Such slaughter would slow down most any other group. . . ." Perhaps Hitler is a myth and there were no gas chambers. Maybe it's all a lie, so, fellow Freethinkers, shove out your money to the *Truth Seeker* and get tripe of this type—that is, if you like this in the good name of Freethought.

Freethinkers meet on the basis of being anti-religious. They know nothing, so far as they are concerned, in regard to their own camp, of Jew or Gentile, white or colored. They may have any political view they like; but, they are united as *Freethinkers*, not as politicians or races. The *Truth Seeker*, undoubtedly, wouldn't have encountered any difficulty under Herr Streicher. Schickelgruber would have relished its editorial slant. After all, when one believes that there are "inferior" races and the Jews and Negroes don't possess the blue blood of the *Truth Seeker* editor and crew—what in blazes is wrong with exterminating the ones who are polluting the valued "blood stream?" This brings to mind Aesop's fable about the wolf and the lamb drinking at the same stream.

The benighted *Truth Seeker* editor ends his foul piece, "Semitic Freethought," with the following:

> "Haldeman-Julius, who says that he dislikes praise, published the statement by Mordecai T. Heller that Haldeman-Julius is a 'giant' and that Gauvin and Smith are 'midgets.' We leave unanswered, as well 'boorish,' 'stupidity,' 'melancholy,' 'oafish,' 'stooges,' 'bigoted,' 'senile,' 'shoddy,'

'racketeering,' 'hate-ridden,' 'crass,' 'vile sheet,' and other Semitic arguments."

Evidently, he doesn't like things called by their right name.

Here we have another great discovery made by the retarded editor—"Semitic arguments." His jealousy of Haldeman-Julius and his achievements in the world of Freethought and popular education is, by this time, quite well known. Aside from crying for donations and begging for legacies, the editor of the stupid *Truth Seeker* has made a fool of himself in the Freethought world.

And last, but not least, "Semitic arguments."

Again, I will quote from that marvelous contribution to Free thought knowledge, "Semitic Freethought":

> "The two groups which have gone out of their way to attack the *Truth Seeker* are examples of promoters of Semitic Freethought. They are more concerned with immediate promises than with the probable consequences of their policies. They prefer communism to capitalism, Soviet Russia to the United States; and thus, though they pretend otherwise, are champions of dictatorship."

This comes from a man who just elected "himself" as the representative of the following organizations to the International Congress of Freethinkers at Rome. He is supposed to represent the following organizations; but, when the meetings were held at which he was elected delegate, no one knows. He just appointed himself. These are the stooge groups the editor is to represent:

> The National Liberal League
> The American Association for the Advancement of Atheism.
> The *Truth Seeker*.

This is the weeping, pious person who has so much to say about dictatorship. We should like to get the results of the vote taken at the organizational meetings which allowed him to represent the groups. Let's get them, *Mr. Truth Seeker*. Was there a minority? Didn't you let out another of your wails for money and aren't you going to use the monies derived to take yourself to Rome? Is this what *you* call democracy?

In the first place, no group went "out of its way" to attack this mentally bankrupt publication. The editor's idiocies had become quite well known in the movement. Haldeman-Julius acted as a decent, enlightened. humanitarian Freethinker when he cast the light on the *Truth Seeker* and its racism. And, if the befogged editor has Wm. McCarthy in mind when he makes reference to "Semitic" Freethinkers, let me inform him that Mr. McCarthy is a hearty, ruddy faced Irishman who put the skids under the *Truth Seeker's* owner by publishing, at his own expense, and not with monies collected from Freethinkers to supposedly advance their movement, a devasting piece of exposure called "Democracy or Dictatorship? A reply to Lawyer Smith and the *Truth Seeker*." Perhaps Mr. McCarthy was made an "honorary Semite," somewhat along the lines that Hitler used when he bathed Hirohito in the spiritual pool of "honorary" Aryanism.

It is poor taste to mention the word "rope" in a hangman's house, and the least said about dictatorship by this dictatorial individual, the better off he remains.

Let us examine the tactics he utilizes in trying to offset the flag-waving observation. Real patriotism is a decent and marvelous emotion; but, it is anything but that when it is used as what Samuel Johnson called the last retreat of scoundrels. The Roman Catholic Church, too calls itself patriotic, and the editor has many things in common with her when it comes to social philiosophy. Haldeman-Julius, as has been stated before, showed a rare courage and devotion to rationalistic principles when he exposed this puny mentality who has not even the understanding necessary to realize that he is making a laughing stock of himself both at home and abroad. Freethinkers are now well aware of the price they had to pay in the retardation of their cause by

having this individual try to take full control of their movement. This self-appointed pope (even the Roman pope is elected, but in the *Truth Seeker's* domain he elects himself) has repeatedly shown a bitter hostility against any and all other rationalistic groups or organizations unless he managed to gain control.

The *Truth Seeker* writes:

> "The 'Flag waving' consisted of expressing a preference for the United States [call out Sousa's band] over Soviet Russia. But since these Semitic Freethinkers have raised the issue, it is in order to consider the record. In World War 1 the present editor of the *Truth Seeker* spent nearly three years in the armed forces of the United States, one half of it in Eastern Siberia. He was not drafted. Where was Haldeman-Julius?"

Again, let us see what the record shows when the *Truth Seeker* starts becoming patriotic.

But, in World War 1, Haldeman-Julius writes, "I was married and a father at the time we registered for the draft in that war. The marriage took place on June 1, 1916, and our first child, Alice, was born on May 26, 1917. I was put in Class 2, which meant I was to be called up immediately after the list of single men (class 1) was used up. Class 2 was never called. This sort of stuff means the *Truth Seeker* is getting pretty low."

In one phase, I disagree with Haldeman-Julius. The *Truth Seeker* is not "going" pretty low; it already got there a long time ago. The bovine editor of that publication, shrieking his head off that it is a Freethought journal, seeing that he is under the light of day, gives as his considered opinion:

> "Where were the other Semitic Freethiners who are campaigning against the *Truth Seeker?* Our opinion is that most of them served in neither war and are potential Judith Coplons [page the yellow press] who would betray their country to a slave state and when caught hysterically scream that they are loyal Americans."

In his insane rage against Haldeman-Julius, the editor of the lamentable *Truth Seeker* makes the dastardly charge, without, of course, getting his facts straight first, that Haldeman-Julius was "not married" during World War 1. I suppose when his friends put him straight, as they must have done after he launched his great discovery that there was no such phenomenon as hypnotism, he noted in the September issue of his dictatorial paper, under the caption of "A Statement," that Haldeman-Julius *was* married during that war. Note: there was no apology, no explanation for reasons of error, no social amenity. Typical *Truth Seeker* tactics!

Who are the persons who come out to defend this vicious sheet? Gauvin! That he stands condemned as not alone a boorish fool and clown but also as a stupid anti-Semite is patent from his *own* writings in this controversy.

It is important to assist Freethought and help the battle against the encroachments of the church. But, it is likewise just as important to prevent any single, self-seeking individual, such as the clownish editor of the decaying *Truth Seeker*, from getting any power in the movement. The sole way to put a stop to this piece of gentle graft is to enlighten fellow-Freethinkers so that they will not give up their money to a one-man movement. Fellow Freethinkers, we are against theologic dictatorships. Aren't we likewise against the same disease when it infects our movement?

*Ecrasez L'infame!*

---

## RACISM IN *TRUTH SEEKER*

S. S. Neiss, Newark, N. J.: "In the August, 1949, *Truth Seeker* the viewpoint of the anti-Semite was evident in several statements. In its editorial, 'Semitic Freethought,' the *Truth Seeker* talks about Haldeman-Julius' service in the first World War, hints at E.H.-J.'s evasion as a certainty, with an allusion to profiteering (one of the stock 'arguments' of the anti-Semites—'All Jews evade service,

secretly promote wars and profiteer'). Of course, our largest corporations, whose size and wealth have grown tremendously with each war, escape this condemnation, and steam is let off against Jews. But despite the slurs, in both wars, Jews have served in numbers of about twice their population ratio, while the Christian theological schools swelled their attendance by 10-fold by eager beavers who wanted to evade war in order to serve a non-existent god. If the *Truth Seeker's* statement: 'Our opinion is that most of them (Jews) served in neither war and are potential Judy Coplons, etc.,' is not anti-Semitic, then an anti-Semitic line has never been written or spoken in all history. For every Judy Coplon, there are dozens of non-Jewish traitors, spies and despicable persons, yet no one, especially Jews, blames all their faith for the actions of a few. Does the*Truth Seeker* know a majority of the 4,5000,000 American Jews intimately enough to make such a sweeping accusation? Later, the *Truth Seeker* tries to convey the thought that Jews talk of their scientists, musicians, philanthropists but not of their murderers, crooks, and the like. Despite employment and educational handicaps imposed on Jews throughout history, they have contributed in greater proportion to their numbers to the important scientists, musicians, etc., and in lesser proportion to the jail population and relief rolls. The above is not opinion but statistics, and can be checked. In Gauvin's article, he quotes a Mr. Steed as saying 'the fate of the Jews in Germany might be due in part to the efforts of the Jews as Communists to destroy the German state.' If true, this should have won the Jews the world's eternal blessing, for it later remained for what is called the civilized world to destroy the German state. But, like all situations involving Jews, it is confused and out of the confusion the most self-contradictory stories are believed about the Jews. The German Communists had a membership that was overwhelmingly Gentile, for the Jews number less than 1 percent of the population of Germany. With something like 600,000 Jews in all Germany at the time Hitler took power, which included children, women, and the extremely old, it doesn't make sense to blame them for the votes registered by the Communist party, the total of which was up in the millions. The *Truth Seeker's* slip is showing too when it mentions, with what seems like regret, that there are more Jews now than before the Nazis killed 6,000,000. I do not know the *Truth Seeker's* reason for mentioning this point except to imply that, by some Jewish magic, even after you kill 6,000,000, it's a small matter; they increase anyway. Out of simple honesty, it should have been said that despite the slaughter of many more millions of many faiths and nationalities, the world's population grows. The brutal reference to great massacres, almost as if they were beneficial ritual, befits no one."

---

# THE ANTI-SEMITISM OF THE "TRUTH SEEKER" AND ITS DEFENDERS

## By Mordecai T. Heller

It seems that the editor of the *Truth Seeker* does not relish having his ideas and racism drawn out into the public light. In my letter, "Anti-Semitism in the *Truth Seeker*" (*Critic and Guide*, April, 1949) I emphasized the importance of the fact that if the interested Freethinker wanted the truth, *to go to the record itself!* That the *Truth Seeker* has sadly deteriorated since the death of Mr. George Macdonald and has taken on a policy of anti-Semitism and general racism needs no argumentation. The proof is painfully obvious.

Also, that its editor is more interested in seeking legacies than in searching for truth needs but little if any, explanation, nor does he desire it to be known that any donation or legacy given to his magazine in the interests of furthering the movement becomes *his private property*. He can use it as he sees fit and is under no obligation to give anyone an accounting for the way it is spent. The publication, then, can continue its sadly backward policy and dish out Freethought with a thimble and racism with a bucket. It was also brought to the attention of readers that it would be wise to be on guard against the editor's slight-of-hand tactics to get their attention off the main point.

After having received some much-needed criticism from *The American Freeman,* for which true, decent, liberal Freethinkers must be indebted to Mr. Haldeman-Julius, and some little attention from myself, (*Critic and Guide,* April and July, 1949) the editor of this vicious sheet which reeks of prejudices, especially that of an anti-Semitic type, avoids making an answer himself, but puts up one of his stooges for the task.

In the leading editorial in the May *Truth Seeker,* under the caption of "The Editor Stands Accused" this evasive, self-appointed, conceited, would-be leader of the Freethought movement tries to give the impression that, at long last, he is answering serious and vitally important criticisms leveled at him. Now, one thinks, he will receive an explanation for the editor's bovine contributions to modern scientific thought, namely, that hypnotism is a fake, that there is serious doubt whether there is such a state of mind as is termed amnesia, that split personality is a fairy tale and that post hypnotic suggestion is a childish belief. But, alas, what is this editorial given over to? Believe it or not—an enumeration of the editor's alleged virtues.

1. That he doesn't smoke.

2. That he is practically a total abstainer from alcohol.

3. That he has been accused of being unsociable and ascetic.

4. That he doesn't like the jokes that appear in *The American Freeman.*

5. That he doesn't gorge himself at the table.

6. That he is "not greatly disturbed" when a book by a "four-letter-word" genius is suppressed. (Neither are the religionists, puritans and modern Torquemadas).

Who made the charges? Ah, but, this is the editor's sly way of confusing the issue with his usual smoke screen. Too many of us have become wise to his tactics. Incidentally, in this same issue, on a back page, there is an announcement that a legacy of almost $20,000 has been received. A big catch. This business of fishing for legacies rather than for truth sometimes brings results. . . . We can, I suppose, look forward to more printer's bills being paid for publication of racist attacks upon Jews and liberals.

As the editor wouldn't deign to defend himself, he generally utilizes the services of a dupe or stooge. In this instance we find, again in the same issue, an article by Mr. Marshall J. Gauvin, titled "Haldeman-Julius Raves." It is supposed to be a defence of the *Truth Seeker* regarding the charges of anti-Semitism and a clearance of the observation made that it is stupidly edited.

As Mr. Gauvin steps into the picture in the role of arbiter, it would be advisable to examine his qualifications and to ascertain the level of his objectivity. Before I do this, however, I should like to offer an example of Mr. Gauvin's attachment for the editor and to what lengths it oft takes him.

While Mr. Gauvin was in the employ of the editor, Mr. Joseph Lewis wrote a book in which he maintained that Thomas Paine was the author of the Declaration of Independence. Now, bear in mind that Mr. Lewis is the head of another Freethought publication and society. The loving editor saw

an opportunity to make him a bit uncomfortable. He had not one but two hostile reviews of the book appear in his paper.

At the time I commented about this matter (*Critic and Guide*, April, 1949) I pointed out that one of the reviewers had, himself, made the statement that, "The Declaration of Independence was probably not written by Thomas Jefferson at all, but by *Thomas Paine*." I didn't want to embarrass Mr. Gauvin then nor do I want to now; but, in the interests of truth let it be said that the aforementioned opinion was rendered by Mr. Marshall J. Gauvin in his "The Gauvin-Olson Debates on God and the Bible," p. 57. The book marks that it was followed by (Applause).

There is no harm in a man's changing his mind about anything; but why didn't Mr. Gauvin see fit to state in his piece on Mr. Lewis's book that, at one time, he, too, held a similar opinion? Though I don't agree with the proposition that Paine wrote the Declaration of Independence, I do like a fair fight.

Let us return to the question of anti-Semitism and the question of Mr. Gauvin's ability to be a fair judge in this matter. Before I go much further into this controversy, I should like to state that many anti-Semites are not aware of their venom. One often hears the barbed remark, "Why, some of my best friends are Jews." As jurors are carefully examined before trial as to their impartiality, it should be fitting to look into Mr. Gauvin's qualifications as a judge of what anti-Semitism is or is not. In his *Truth Seeker* article he acts the role of the good Samaritan by advising as follows:

> "How odd it would be to discover that the man who finds anti-Semitism where there is none, (Mr. Haldeman-Julius, I suppose) who is ever raising the issue of anti-Semitism, *which sensible Jews would be well advised to leave alone*, keeps the fact that he is a Jew in the background instead of proudly identifying himself with his people and pleading the great part they have played in the progress of the world."

I wonder whether Mr. Gauvin ever read "My First 25 Years" by Mr. Haldeman-Julius, one of his recent publications, and found any evidence of hiding. Aside from the value Mr. Gauvin's advice might have to "sensible Jews," I think they can well do without it. Ye, Gods! "Sensible Jews" after 6,000,000 of their own group were butchered by the elite of the *herrenvolk*, should leave the question of anti-Semitism "alone." Mr. Gauvin, undoubtedly, is a thinker of profound parts and humanitarian sympathies. I am sure that the editor of the *Truth Seeker* is indebted to him. This is what one calls a real defence, shyster style.

It may not be amiss to quote from Mr. Gauvin's writings so that the decent, honest, well-meaning Freethinkers may derive an idea of his own opinions about the Jews. *Let the record speak for itself!*

In a book purportedly dealing with the *fundamentals* of Freethought Mr. Gauvin has the following gem:

> "Therefore they enjoined the Jewish people to give this diseased and poisonous flesh to the stranger dwelling among them, or to sell it to aliens. *And may we not conclude that it would be asking too much to expect an enterprising Jew to give away what he might sell?*" ("Fundamentals of Freethought," pp. 110 and 111).

At this point, Mr. Gauvin suddenly becomes tremendously interested in the health of the Gentiles and indulges his humanitarian soul in a bit of rabble rousing. He writes:

> "How would you like, Mr. Christian, [note the "Mr. Christian"] to have a butcher sell to you for use on your table, the flesh of a creature that died of itself? Your wife has been very ill. The fever, at last, begins to wane. Delirium gives place to rational consciousness.

The heart again beats with high hope. The eyes resume their former brightness. The pallid cheek is once more illuminated with the divine smile [why "divine?"] of good woman's love. Your wife, the mother of your children, is convalescent. The physician in attendance prescribes beef-broth. Now comes a butcher to your door with a large cut of beef from an ox that died of itself—died of disease. For this reason he would not have his family eat it, but being a devout believer in the inspiration of the Bible, [so is the Christian, Mr. Gauvin] he is perfectly willing to obey the sacred word and sell the poisonous flesh to you, in order that your delicate wife may have beef-broth. What would you think, Mr. Christian, [why is a Freethinker so interested in the health of Christians?] of a butcher who would commit such a crime against yourself and the woman you love. *Would you not be in favor of teaching him a lesson in common humanity with the full penalty of the law?"*

In his obsequious defence of the racist and anti-Semitic material characteristic of the *Truth Seeker*, Mr. Gauvin had the brazen gall to ask why a "bill of particulars" wasn't offered. Why didn't Mr. Gauvin give us such a bill in regard to *any* butchers, regardless of race, color or creed, who were selling tainted meat? Why didn't he stop wrapping the mantle of patriotism (page Dr. Johnson) around himself and act as a true patriot by doing his civic duty by going to the nearest Board of Health Station and reporting the infraction? Does he know of *any* Jewish butcher selling such meat? Is he aware that what he is talking about is ancient custom, tribal mores, which were kept both by Jew and Christian?

Mr. Gauvin also says that he had reason in the past to praise Mr. Haldeman-Julius for the great Freethought work he was doing, but that the praise was not accepted. Perhaps Mr. Haldeman-Julius possessed prophetic insight.

In closing I think it might throw some light on respective values to offer the opinion of the world's outstanding Freethinker and scholar: Mr. Joseph McCabe. Let us see what *he* thinks of Mr. Haldeman-Julius.

"Haldeman-Julius's one direction to me was: Call a lie a lie—a damned lie, if you like—wherever you spot it. . . . *Haldeman-Julius has done more for Freethought than all the freethinking organizations put together."*

Let us fumigate the Freethought movement from vermin. We have much to do to bring about a rational world.

# THE ANTI-SEMITISM OF THE "TRUTH SEEKER"

## By Mordecai T. Heller

Now that the editor of the *Truth Seeker* is aware that many Freethinkers have wisened themselves up to him and his tactics, he reverts to his usual pattern of smearing, and avoiding the main issue by a smoke-screen of sophistry. His recent scurrilous attack on The American Freeman clearly illustrates the point.

It would be advisable to remember that what the *Truth Seeker* fears most is that Freethinkers may learn that whatever donations or legacies are given over to it become the private property of its owner. A large number of legacies are, undoubtedly, bequeathed by persons thinking they are giving it to a "movement." Such is not the case. The editor accepts them, and can continue his anti-Semitic, racist and political policies in the publication. He is the "owner" as well as editor.

To be fair and impartial, it is

urged on those who are interested in the futherance of Rationalism and Liberalism to accept no one's word in this matter, but *to go to the record!* Let it speak for itself. Your observation, Mr. Haldeman-Julius, that the *Truth Seeker* is "stupidly edited" requires no elucidation other than a look at its policy since the death of Mr. George Macdonald. When the present editor took over the *Truth Seeker* it began to show a marked penchant for the "superior race" ideology, and, incidentally, as the editor was wise enough to choose proper ancestors, he is a member of the "superior" race—the so-called "Caucasian." Negroes, Jews and races other than Caucasian are, therefore, not on a level with the *herrenvolk*, and, so, must accept the niche into which the editor places them. Of course, their contributions and legacies, regardless of the fact that they stem from inferior stock, are welcome. When it comes to this, everyone is equal. Money speaks, nay, it shrieks with the *Truth Seeker*.

The editor's charge of "dictatorship" against others is in poor taste. Many of us have read with deep interest "Democracy or Dictatorship?" sub-titled "A Reply to Lawyer Smith and the *Truth Seeker*" and we know quite well who the dictator is. The brazen effrontery of the editor in claiming that The American Freeman had been aroused to attack him because he licked his chops over the racist material found in Darlington's Conway Memorial Lecture is on a piece with the other sly tactics pursued by the *Truth Seeker*. The attempt to becloud the real issue will get the editor exactly and precisely, nowhere. When the record is pulled out to show that he is viciously anti-Semitic, he whines that it is not so, and his victimized dupes echo that they see no racism in it. Fortunately, we have quite a large number of decent, honest, clear-headed, liberal Freethinkers of all shades of political and philosophic thought who won't put up with this unmitigated nonsense.

Again, let us look at the record.

When the film "Oliver Twist" was about to be shown in the United States with the character Fagin depicted in a fashion that would please the heart of a Hitler or Streicher, the *Truth Seeker* saw fit to make the following comment:

> "Jews prevented the showing in the United States of a British film version of Dickens' 'Oliver Twist' containing a Jewish character named Fagin, and Catholics forced a Hollywood studio to delete the fact that Richelieu was a cardinal.
>
> "A rule in Hollywood's production code reads, 'Ministers of religion in their character as ministers of religion should not be used as comic characters or as villains.' Jews have virtually decreed that in the movie and in novels no comic character or villain shall be a Jew. In fiction, all ministers and all Jews are honest, respectable, upright, dignified citizens."

Note how the anti-Semitism is packed in so that the poison is sweetened up by seemingly Freethought criticism: "*In fiction*, all ministers and *all Jews* are honest, respectable, upright, dignified citizens."

It is one thing for a Rationalist to criticize Judaism as a religion; it is another when he attacks Jews as Jews, hewing close to the line laid down by Hitler and Co. When 6,000,000 helpless and utterly defenceless Jews were murdered by sadists because they belonged to an "inferior race" did the *Truth Seeker*, vaunted herald of Liberalism, raise a whimper of protest? When the Fascists under the devout Franco were madly butchering liberals of all shades of opinion, did the editor see fit to make any comment?

Did he raise his voice in behalf of liberty and freedom?

As to who is and who is not an anti-Semite, perhaps, the Jews, having suffered for so many thousands of years have acquired the impulse to be the best judges of that. They can distinguish anti-Semitism even when it is cleverly

disguised. They do not require the services of the *Truth Seeker* to make a diagnosis.

When you, Mr. Haldeman-Julius, pointed out so plainly in the March, 1949, issue of The American Freeman that, "The evidence is clear and abundant that the present editor (of the *Truth Seeker*) is viciously anti-Semitic, quite ignorant of modern scientific and philosophic thought, and disposed to deliver foolish and absurd opinions on topics far beyond his limited knowledge and his mental depth" . . . and "is a serious liability to the Rationalist movement," you showed a courage and devotion to Freethought that many other of its leaders may, unfortunately, lack. You have contributed to a much needed "house-cleaning" in the movement and many of us are grateful to you. Apropos your remark that the editor is disposed to "deliver foolish and absurd opinions on topics far beyond his limited knowledge and his mental depth," one can derive a fair sample from the following exhibition he gave in regard to a matter which certainly didn't require any high I.Q., and which evinced an ignorance rarely found in any movement, particularly a Rationalist one.

After years of meditation and study, the proud editor makes this valuable contribution to 20th century scientific thought: namely, that hypnotism is a fake, that he doubts that there is such a state of mind as is called split-personality, and also that he holds serious doubts that there is such a condition as amnesia. To prove his great discovery (which, if true, would make fools out of all practicing psychiatrists) he offers this gem of logical demonstration:

> "It is claimed that if one suggests to a hypnotized person that at a specified time he will perform a certain act, he will at that time, though not hypnotized, perform the act. We doubt it.
>
> "At any rate, this kind of suggestion does not always work. Last December, welterweight Eric Boon, being worried about his chances of beating British champion Ernie Roderick in their title bout, submitted himself to a course of six hypnotic sleeps. While he dozed, he was told repeatedly, 'You're going to lick the bum . . . you're going to lick the bum. . . .' He lost the first 12 rounds, and the decision."

This is the editor's profound understanding of post-hypnotic suggestion. Is this type of idiocy helping us against the forces of religion? Will such manifestations of "superior race" mentality assist us in battling against the encroachments of the powerful church? Is this a level of intelligence fit to edit a Freethought publication?

Mr. Haldeman-Julius, you put it mildly, indeed, when you termed it a "stupidly edited" paper. You observed quite justly, "The *Truth Seeker*, which has vulgarized Freethought by turning it into a cheap, small-time racket, may please certain polite and refined Jew-haters, but as a force for mind-cleansing Rationalism it's a melancholy failure, a disgrace to a noble movement that's based on humane impulses and decent, honest thinking. It serves, by means of a half-ounce thimble, just enough Freethought to warrant passing the collection plate. . . . It loathes anyone who dares to try to fight obscurantism, and clericalism, because its hate-infested editors feel they should have a monopoly in that field. They dish out Freethought with an eye-dropper when the times demand forthright, wholehearted, thorough campaigns against super-naturalism. It takes one of the ugliest things the Catholic Church has produced—anti-Semitism—and makes it a part of its own ignoble, vulgar, sickening, bigoted propaganda."

Would it not be fitting to inquire why the editor removed from the masthead of the *Truth Seeker* the "platform" which had graced it for so many years—"Freethought, Free Speech, Democracy, Equal Rights, and Impartial Liberty"?

Is there anything to the obser-

vation made by the editor of the *Truth Seeker,* "Though lying should be avoided, it is neither necessary nor advisable to tell the full truth all the time?"

Accept neither his word nor mine. Watch carefully if he makes any reply to the searching criticisms of The American Freeman. So far he hasn't tried to refute my letter titled "Anti-Semitism In The *Truth-Seeker*" which appeared in the April, 1949, issue of The Critic and Guide. If he does, go to the record itself. To be forewarned is to be forearmed.

---

# THE "TRUTH SEEKER'S" NEW LOW

## By E. Haldeman-Julius

THE ignorant and bigoted *Truth Seeker* lies when it says I dodged the draft in the first World War. I was married and a father at the time we registered for the draft in that war. The marriage took place on June 1, 1916, and our first child, Alice, was born on May 26, 1917. I was put in Class 2, which meant I was to be called up immediately after the list of single men (Class 1) was used up. Class 2 was never called. This sort of stuff means the *Truth Seeker* is going pretty low.

The editorial in which the above piece of shameless journalism appeared was entitled "Semitic Freethought," one of the most anti-Semitic pieces I've read in years, not excepting the fulminations of fanatics like Rev. Gerald L. K. Smith and Rev. Gerald B. Winrod. So now we have Gentile (versus non-Aryan) Freethought! It's come to this.

In another place in the *Truth Seeker,* that pathetic fumbler, Marshall Gauvin, offers a list of saintly, pure-minded authors who never wrote "the kind of stuff in which Haldeman-Julius seems to revel." Here he includes Burns (author of that masterpiece of erotology, "The Merry Muse"!) and Mark Twain (author of the pornographic "1601, or Social Life in the Time of the Tudors"!) I'll gladly lend him my copies if he'll promise to read them and not turn me in to the cops.

Mr. Gauvin, that tireless windbag, wonders why I included Voltaire in my list of free-minded authors who weren't afraid to write about s-e-x, if you'll pardon the expression. I'm sure Mr. Gauvin, that flatulent bore, doesn't know that the customs officials in New York harbor watch fatuously to keep Voltaire's unexpurgated, wicked, grand "Candide" from entering our pious country and ruining our fairest maidens. As for Tolstoi, I recommend that Mr. Gauvin read some of the great Russian's novels in which women actually indulge in what the Rev. Fiddle, D. D., called fornicaboodling, a word that he stole from Patsy O'Bang, the world's greatest lover. Of course, he would include, among his angelic ones, Lord Byron, the most proficient fornicaboodler in all Europe.

The Gauvin enormity contains a spasm of ingrown virtue that's in the mood and manner of Priscilla Prissy-Pratt. I'm supposed to revel in "dirt." My list of more than 2,500 books is an easy reply to such a stupid, ignorant assertion. My own writings range the avenues and bypaths of culture. Here and there I take a look at sexology and even erotology. The rest wil be found given to the subjects that Gauvin says he admires but about which he writes so ignorantly. He recommends a list of authors who might serve to cleanse my tainted soul. Here are the Gauvin-selected "philosophers, historians, poets and novelists" who didn't "revel" in dirt and who should be given an opportunity to wash out my filthy brains and purify my wayward soul. I should "revel" in Mr. Gauvin's list, which follows:

Gibbon, Lecky, Buckle, Macaulay, Carlyle, Ruskin, Mill Tennyson,

Burns, Shelley, Byron, Keats, George Eliot, Dickens, Scott, Thackeray, Poe, Stevenson, Mark Twain, "to name but a few."

Yes, it looks as though Gauvin looked into my list of titles before compiling the above, for all of them—and hundreds of others—are represented among my Little Blue Books and volumes in larger format. My edition of Gibbon's great chapters, "On Christianity," is the only work of his in print at this moment in the U. S. A., and has been in print for about 25 years. Lecky will be found scattered throughout scores of books by Joseph McCabe. Only a few months ago I brought out a volume entitled, "The Wisdom of Thomas Buckle," containing hundreds of quotations from his great historical works. As for Lord Macaulay, he was one of the first authors I drew on for my Little Blue Books about 30 years ago. You'll find Carlyle's "Sartor Resartus" and some miscellaneous essays, including the famous one on Dr. Johnson, in my Little Blue Books. John Ruskin I've published, of course, the latest title being his life-story, which followed other volumes containing his art criticisms and discussions on social problems in England. I did Mill's "On Liberty" and booklets on "The Subjection of Women" (pardon the dirty thought) and his famous essay on the God-idea. Tennyson's poetry will be found in a half dozen volumes which I issued many years ago. The poetry of Burns has long been in the list, though I had to omit his precious "Merry Muse," particularly that amusing poem, "The Fumbler." Shelley, Byron and Keats were too important for me to pass over, so you'll find their poetry in my booklets. George Eliot's essays have been drawn on for Little Blue Books, of course. Dickens' "Pickwick Papers" and "A Christmas Carol" have been popular publications here for decades. Scott's longer poems, too, carry my imprint. As for Poe, one of my big favorites, I have eight of his books of short stories and poems, and a larger work entitled, 'The Wisdom of Edgar Allan Poe." Stevenson's stories and essays had to be drawn on for eight volumes, including his "Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde." I have published 10 booklets by Mark Twain, one of my pets. "The Wit and Wisdom of Thackeray" is still available. So there you are. The very names he throws at me in an attempt to brand me as an enemy of everything that's decent are the ones you'll find represented in my series, with hundreds of others that could be called up as witnesses.

Some months ago I learned that the *Truth Seeker* had the plates of about a dozen Freethought masterpieces that have been out of print for decades. I was shocked at such a melancholy situation and offered to rent them on what seemed to be reasonable terms so that the plates could be sent to press again and thereby make possible the enlightenment of tens of thousands of readers who certainly need those fine works. My offer was rejected. Those Freethought classics are still out of print, despite the fact that these Freethought racketeers have plenty of money.

Working for Freethought is tough going, and expensive. It's much more fun to turn one's editorial guns on a Freethinker who's always on the alert to track down and reproduce neglected Freethought masterpieces. And when they aren't slandering me they're thinking up Hitlerian editorials like the one entitled "Semitic Freethought," in which we're actually told that "Jew Freethinkers" (remember "the Jew book"?) base their appeals on their emotions while Aryan or Gentile Freethinkers rely on logic, reason and appeals to the spirit of pure science.

Hitlerism isn't dead. A feather from that vulture has been rescued and is now being treasured by a group of American Freethinkers who place attacks on "Semitic Freethought" above the need for enlightenment on clericalism and religious orthodoxy. In truth, American Freethought has been outraged.

The *Truth Seeker* tells us to be guided in political matters by Bradlaugh and Ingersoll. Freethinkers who are Republicans certainly can find material they'll like in Ingersoll's political addresses, but they'll

look in vain if they hope to find anti-Semitic utterances in any of Ingersoll's lectures, essays or letters. The same goes for Bradlaugh. He was a Conservative in politics, but he wasn't a contemptible, stupid, sadistic Jew-baiter.

The childish *Truth Seeker* can claim "credit" for coining what even Hitler's Dr. Goebbels failed to create as part of the propaganda arsenal in the Nazis' war on "non-Aryans"—"Semitic Freethought." What an intellectual abortion! This, I fancy, will take a conspicuous place in history's museum of absurdities. We're told, by the senile *Truth Seeker*, that "just as 'Christian Science' is not a science, so Semitic Freethought is not Freethought, but is desire, a politico-economic program, masquerading as reason. It deceives the uncritical."

The above, without a doubt, is one of the most amazing pieces of stupidity ever to come from the sick brains of a clique of ignorant, hysterical, humorless asses. The history of Freethought shows that a conservative like Bradlaugh can be a Freethinker, that a Republican like Ingersoll can be a Freethinker, that a moderate Socialist like Victor L. Berger can be a Freethinker, that a militant Socialist like Eugene V. Debs can be a Freethinker, that a Tolstoyan Anarchist, Single Taxer and Libertarian like Clarence Darrow can be a Freethinker, that a Communist like Lenin can be a Freethinker, that a Fascist like Mussolini can be a Freethinker, that a Bolshevik like Trotsky can be a Freethinker, that an Anarchist like Emma Goldman can be a Freethinker, that an Individualist like Herbert Spencer can be a Freethinker, that a Royalist like Frederick the Great can be a Freethinker, that a Laborite like Harold J. Laski can be a Freethinker, that a political indifferentist like Chapman Cohen can be a Freethinker, that a Philosophical Anarchist like Voltairine De Clyre can be a Freethinker, that a Communist Anarchist like Benjamin R. Tucker can be a Freethinker, that several Popes in the Vatican can be Freethinkers, that an anti-democrat like Voltaire can be a Freethinker, that a Communist like Joseph McCabe can be a Freethinker, that a Zionist like Paul Eldridge can be a Freethinker, that an anti-Monarchist like H. G. Wells can be a Freethinker, that a political tyrant like Catherine the Great can be a Freethinker, that an anti-Socialist like Mencken can be a Freethinker, that a Monist like Haeckel can be a Freethinker, that a Scientist like Darwin can be a Freethinker, that a Poet like Goethe can be a Freethinker, that a professional Revolutionist like Thomas Paine can be a Freethinker, that a humanitarian statesman like Lincoln can be a Freethinker, that a musical genius like Beethoven can be a Freethinker.

In short, you can belong to any political, economic, artistic, literary or philosophical school of thought or program of action and still be a Freethinker. To be a Freethinker one rejects the assumptions of Theism, the dogmas of the theologians, the "divine truths" of "inspired books," and any of the other notions that go with religious ideology. The fact that I'm a democratic Socialist doesn't prevent me from being a Freethinker. I can have sound, or unsound, political ideas and still be a Freethinker if I accept the idea that we strive to achieve what seem to be hints of the truth without resorting to the dogmas of sacred, holy books or men who present themselves as authorities but who aren't to be checked and examined according to the methods of reason and the rules of logic.

In short, since anyone can be a Freethinker—except Theists, theologians and the like—it follows that a Freethinker doesn't have to abandon political, economic, social, sexual, esthetic and other patterns of belief or behavior in order to remain a Freethinker.

However, there are certain conventions that make sense and which are generally accepted among Freethinkers. One is that the editor of a Freethought publication that's some sort of an official organ of an association of Freethinkers should

make his own writings and those of his contributors hew to the line of Freethought, for that's all there is to the paper.

A lecturer who is sent out by some society of Freethinkers mustn't become a diversionist and ring in discussions of politics, economics, sociology, and the like, that don't happen to be related to the central aim of Freethought. The reason Freethought editors and lecturers should stick to that one suject is simple: that's the job they've taken up, while the many varied thinkers mentioned in a previous paragraph can take Freethought, or leave Freethought, as they see fit.

In my own case, it happens that I'm a freelance jounalist, uncommitted to any party, group, society or organization of any kind. Therefore it's in order that I, writing as a freelance journalist and not responsible to any organized body, can roam all the fields of learning (if able to) and discuss any subject I jolly well care to touch on—from Nudism to Vegetarianism, from sexology to erotology, from democratic Socialism to Communism, from Bolshevism to Fascism, from Catholicism to Rotary, from free beer to free love, from Washington to Moscow—and if I'm all wet no one's hurt but myself, because I'm writing as an individual and not as the mouthpiece of an organization.

In the case of the *Truth Seeker* it's different, because the publication is supposed to be the official organ of a body of Freethinkers. Here it's completely out of order for a contributor like Mr. Gauvin to use the medium for anti-Socialism, or anti-Communism, or anti-Capitalism, or anti-Vegetarianism, or anti-Nudism, or any other 'ism." Such an editor is supposed to get a single job done—propagandize Freethought. But instead of doing this necessary and essential educational work, the editors of the *Truth Seeker* go in for anti-Semitism (or what they call "Semitic Freethought"), anti-four-letter-words in current literature, anti-earthy jokes, defenses of the capitalistic system, support for Churchill's reactionary policies, sly defenses of Hitler's campaign of extermination of "inferior races," and so on.

This is an abuse of the conditions under which they were given official recognition by Freethought bodies. Out-and-out Freethought editors should devote themselves to simon-pure Freethought. At the very time that precious space was given to violent and malicious attacks on the editor of The Freeman, Cardinal Spellman was raising holy hell with Mrs. Roosevelt because she wasn't in favor of diverting public money to parochial schools. Here was an issue ready made for a Freethought magazine, but this was barely touched on, while E. Haldeman-Julius—a Freethinker who's also a democratic Socialist—was given the verbal works. More space was given to fighting "Semitic Freethought" than to the conspiracy of the hierarchy to nullify the section of the Constitution that provides for strict separation of Church and State. This is truly calamitous.

In short, fanaticism has taken possession of an important medium for Freethought propaganda. Marshall Gauvin, Charles Smith and Woolsey Teller have decided that it's more important to write anti-Semitic editorials than to fight obscurantism and militant clericalism.

Mr. Gauvin even goes so far as to say, in effect, that it's better to castigate Haldeman-Julius than to meet the sensational issues brought up by Cardinal Spellman and his crew of religious racketeers. Alas, the Freethought movement in America has reached a melancholy impasse, all because of a small clique of hate-breeding, lying, stupid, malicious, ignorant, bigoted traitors to a lofty cause.